

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed February 22, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-19, 25-33 and 44-51 were previously pending in this application. By this paper, claims 1, 10, 25, 27-33, and 47 are being amended and claims 2, 17-18, and 26 have been cancelled. As a result, claims 1, 3-16, 19, 25, 27-33, and 44-51 are pending for examination with claims 1, 10, 25, and 47 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Summary of Interview with Examiner

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for granting an interview on March 24, 2008. During the interview, the Examiner requested the phrase "that may be used to encrypt" be amended in claims 1 and 10 to avoid a 35 U.S.C §112 rejection, similar to the 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 47. The Examiner agreed to accept replacing the phrase "that may be used to encrypt" with "for use in encrypting." Accordingly, Applicants have herein made amendments to claims 1 and 10. In addition, the Examiner objected to the use of "a computer storage medium" in claims 25-33 and requested amendments to claims 25-33. The Examiner agreed to replacing "a computer storage medium" with "a tangible computer storage medium." Accordingly, Applicants have made amendments to claims 25 and 27-33.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 47-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. In particular, the Office Action cites the phrase "that may be used" as rendering claims 47-51 as being indefinite. Applicants have removed the phrase "that may be used to encrypt" in claim 47 and replaced it with the phrase "for use in encrypting." Claims 47-51, as amended, are believed to be in allowable condition. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is kindly requested.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 2, 18, and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form

including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, to accept all the subject matter deemed allowable by the Examiner, independent claim 1 has been rewritten to include limitations from claim 2. Independent claim 10 has been rewritten to include limitations from claims 17 and 18 (claim 18 depends from claim 17), and independent claim 25 has been rewritten to include limitations from claim 26. Claims 2, 17, 18, and 26 have been cancelled. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 10, and 25, as amended, are believed to be in allowable condition. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 10, and 25 is kindly requested.

Applicants also note with appreciation that claims 47-51 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. As shown above in Section I, independent claim 47 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. Therefore, claims 47-51 should be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 47-51 is kindly requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3-4, 10-15, 19, 25, 27-28 and 44-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassan et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,031,913 in view of Rastegar et al. U.S. Publication No. 2004/0091054.

Claims 5-7, 16-17 and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassan et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,031,913 in view of Rastegar et al. U.S. Publication No. 2004/0091054 and further in view of Diffie et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,371,794.

Claims 8-9 and 32-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassan et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,031,913 in view of Rastegar et al. U.S. Publication No. 2004/0091054 and further in view of Kim et al. U.S. Publication No. 2003/0081690.

As noted above in Section II, independent claims 1, 10, and 25 have been amended to incorporate all subject matter of allowable claims 2, 18, and 26 and claims 1, 10, and 25, as amended, are believed to be in allowable condition. Claims 3-9 and 44-46 depend from claim 1, claims 11-16 and 19 depend from claim 10, and claims 27-33 depend from claim 25. Therefore, the rejections of claims 1, 3-16, 19, 25, 27-33, and 44-46 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, any necessary extension of time is hereby requested. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: May 22 2008

Respectfully submitted

By 

Edmund J. Walsh

Registration No.: 32,950

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

Federal Reserve Plaza

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

617.646.8000